

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. Claim 21 has been newly added in accordance with current Office policy, to further and alternatively define Applicants' disclosed invention and to assist the Examiner to expedite compact prosecution of the instant application. No new matter is added. Support for new claim 21 is found, for example, in paragraph [0034] of the specification.

Claims 1-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Knight (NPL - "bye-bye box: applet loading secrets", developer, July 9, 1998, pgs 1-4) in view of Renshaw, U.S. Patent No. 6,065,024. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that none Knight, Renshaw, or their combination, disclose or suggest a method of displaying a markup document linked to an applet, comprising: "delaying display of image output information for the markup document, and synchronizing the delayed image output information for the markup document with applet output information for an applet linked to the markup document, when rendering of the applet is completed, such that the delayed image output information for the markup document and the applet output information for the applet are displayed simultaneously," as recited in claim 1.

Knight neither discloses nor suggests "delaying display of image output information for the markup document or synchronizing the delayed image output information for the markup document with applet output information for an applet linked to the markup document for simultaneous display," because Knight displays a web page on a browser window, and then fills in a gray box that appears prior to loading a java applet using a "nifty 'blue' screen" that is not linked to the web page (see for example, page 3, first full non-program language paragraph), or displays "something flashy to the screen...that will distract the user while they're waiting for all the good stuff from your applet to load" (see, page 2, second full non-program language paragraph). In other words, Knight displays a web page prior to displaying a java applet linked with the web page, and must wait for the java applet to be loaded and subsequently displayed. Accordingly, Knight fails to disclose a method comprising the recited delaying and synchronizing steps of claim 1.

Renshaw also neither discloses nor suggests "delaying display of image output information for the markup document or synchronizing the delayed image output information for the markup document with applet output information for an applet linked to the markup document," because Renshaw displays a first HTML document which has a java applet used to

parse and render a second HTML document to a reserved area of the first HTML document so that the second HTML document is embedded or nested within the first HTML document (see for example, Abstract). As disclosed in Renshaw, the first set of HTML data is parsed and rendered to a first area of a screen, then a second area embedded within the first area of the screen is reserved, then a second set of HTML data is parsed and rendered to the second area of the screen (see, for example, col. 2, lines 9-25). In other words, Renshaw displays a first web page, then uses an imbedded java applet of the first web page to call a second web page to be displayed within the first web page, and each of the steps are performed sequentially.

Renshaw discloses that the steps of rendering a first HTML document may be conducted substantially concurrently with the rendering of the second or an embedded HTML document (see col. 9, lines 20-23). But substantially concurrently, in plain meaning of the claim terms, is neither concurrently nor simultaneously. It appears that Renshaw's time interval between the first rendering and the second rendering is very short, and the renderings would appear to occur substantially concurrently. Accordingly, because of the short time interval between the renderings, Renshaw fails to disclose or suggest renderings that occur concurrently or simultaneously.

Also, Renshaw is absolutely silent as to delaying display of image output information for the markup document, and synchronizing the delayed image output information for the markup document with applet output information for an applet linked to the markup document, when rendering of the applet is completed, such that the delayed image output information for the markup document and the applet output information for the applet are displayed simultaneously, as recited in claim 1, and as described in paragraph [0030] of the Applicant's specification. Instead, Renshaw discloses a small time interval between the first rendering and the second rendering, and discloses that the first HTML document is rendered first. Accordingly, the first HTML document is not delayed and synchronized in Renshaw. Therefore, Renshaw fails to disclose or suggest a method comprising the recited delaying and synchronizing steps of claim 1.

Consequently, claim 1 is patentable over the applied references to Knight, Renshaw, or their combination. Claims 2-8, which depend from claim 1, are likewise patentable over the applied references or their combination for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features they recite. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8 is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Renshaw, U.S. Patent No. 6,065,024, in view of Knight (NPL - "bye-bye box: applet loading secrets", developer, July 9, 1998, pgs 1-4). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that none Renshaw, Knight, or their combination disclose or suggest an information storage medium controlling a computer, wherein "the applet or the markup document includes markup image output delay information used to delay display of the markup document such that image output information of the markup document and applet output information of the applet are to be displayed simultaneously," as recited in claim 9.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that none of Renshaw, Knight, or their combination disclose or suggest a computer system with a display device, wherein the presentation engine delays display of the image output information for the markup document, and synchronizes and outputs the delayed image output information of the markup document and the applet output to the display device, when an output control signal indicating completion of rendering of the applet output is input from the applet executing engine, as recited in claim 15.

As discussed above regarding claim 1, Renshaw displays a first web page, then uses an imbedded java applet of the first web page to call a second web page to be displayed within the first web page, and each of the steps are performed sequentially, while Knight displays a web page prior to displaying a java applet linked with the web page, and must wait for the java applet to be loaded and subsequently displayed. Neither Renshaw nor Knight delays the display of the first web page with respect to the second web page, or delays the display of the web page with respect to the java applet, respectively. In fact, nothing in either Renshaw or Knight facilitates or causes a delay in the display of a web page. Accordingly, none of Renshaw, Knight, or their combination discloses or suggests a markup image output delay information, as recited in claim 9, or the presentation engine that delays display of the image output information for the markup document, as recited in claim 15.

Consequently, claims 9 and 15 are patentable over the applied references to Renshaw, Knight, or their combination. Claims 10-14, which depend from claim 9, and claims 16-18, which depend from claim 15, are likewise patentable over the applied references or their combination for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features they recite. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-18 is respectfully requested.

Claims 19 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Renshaw, U.S. Patent No. 6,065,024. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Renshaw fails to disclose or suggest a computer system with a display device, comprising a programmed computer processor controlling synchronous output of a markup document image including a linked applet image to the display device, according to display control information included in the markup document and/or in the applet, so that the markup document image and the linked applet image are displayed simultaneously as a markup image, as recited in claim 19.

As discussed above regarding claim 1, Renshaw displays a first web page, then uses an imbedded java applet of the first web page to call a second web page to be displayed within the first web page, and each of the steps are performed sequentially, not simultaneously. Further, nothing in Renshaw provides a basis for a synchronous output. Accordingly, Renshaw fails to disclose or suggest a programmed computer processor controlling synchronous output a markup document image including a linked applet image to the display device, or a display control information included in the markup document and/or in the applet, as recited in claim 19.

Consequently, claim 19 is patentable over the applied reference. Claim 20, which depends from claim 19, is also patentable for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 have been newly added to alternatively define Applicants' disclosed invention over the prior art of record. This claim is believed to be allowable at least for the same reasons discussed against all the outstanding rejections of the instant application. A fee of \$ 50 is incurred by the addition of one claim in excess of twenty.

In view of the foregoing amendments, arguments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition to be passed to issue. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney at the Washington DC office at (202) 216-9505.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136. If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 8/16/2006

By: Seth S. Kim
Seth S. Kim
Registration No. 54,577

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510